



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/672,146	09/25/2003	Joseph H. Goldberg	50277-2252	6090

42425 7590 08/09/2007
HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER/ORACLE
2055 GATEWAY PLACE
SUITE 550
SAN JOSE, CA 95110-1089

EXAMINER

THERIAULT, STEVEN B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2179

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/09/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/672,146

Applicant(s)

GOLDBERG ET AL.

Examiner

Steven B. Theriault

Art Unit

2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 5, 7, 10-12, 14, 16 - 17, 19-20, 25, 27, 30-32, 34, 36-37, 39-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are 5, 7, 10-12, 14, 16 - 17, 19-20, 25, 27, 30-32, 34, 36-37, 39-42.

Art Unit: 2179

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the following communications: Amendment filed 05/23/2007

This action is made Final.

2. Claims 5, 7, 10-12, 14, 16 – 17, 19-20, 25, 27, 30-32, 34, 36-37, 39-42 are pending in the case. Claims 5, 7, 10, and 14 are the independent claims. Claims 1-4, 6, 8-9, 13, 15, 18, 21-24, 26, 28, 29, 22, 35, and 38 have been cancelled. The applicant is advised that a new Examiner has been assigned to the case.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 5, 7, 14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 25, 27, 34, 36, 37, 39 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(b) as being anticipated by Krehel et al. (hereinafter Krehel) U.S. Patent No. 6,208,985 issued Mar. 27, 2001.

In regard to Independent claim 5, Krehel teaches a method comprising:

- Prior to executing a search query to perform a search, displaying a user interface on a display, the user interface displaying a graphical representation of the search query, the graphical representation including at least a numerical preview indication of an expected size

of a dataset resulting from application of at least a portion of the query (Krehel column 9, lines 5-67 and figure 16b and column 16, lines 63-67 and column 17, lines 1-25). Krehel shows the process of visually displaying the numerical number of expected size within the dataset and prior to performing a search. The user can perform a tagging operation that tags respective files for the purposes of visually depicting the effects of performing a given operation on the dataset.

- Wherein the displaying of the user interface includes at least displaying a graphical preview indication that is a visually distinct region located in a proximity to an icon representing a filter, the region having a thickness representative of an expected size of the dataset; and wherein the graphical preview indication is separate from the icon (Krehel figure 16b and column 17, lines 1-25 and column 14, lines 60-67). Krehel shows the visually distinct region complete with color where each portion of the data set that matches the query parameters is depicted within the container. The thickness of region of the dataset is representative of the dataset (See column 15, lines 1-26 and column 14, lines 54-67). Krehel shows the preview separate from the filter icon.

In regard to **Independent claim 7**, A method comprising:

- Prior to executing a search query to perform a search, displaying a user interface on a display, the user interface displaying a graphical representation of the search query, the graphical representation including at least a first graphical preview indication that is a first visually distinct region, having a first starting width and a first ending width, the first visually distinct region being located in a proximity to a first icon representing a first filter, and the first ending width having a width that is representative of an expected size of a first dataset; wherein the first graphical preview indication is separate from the first icon; (Krehel Figure 15a and b and 16a and b and column 16, lines 19-67 and column 16, lines 1-46) Krehel shows a graphical representation of a query on the display. The tag operation can be

Art Unit: 2179

performed prior to/after a filter operation where the tag operation is performed prior to a search query. The width of the container is set by the ratio of the input items to the output items (See column 14, lines 54-67). The visual region displaying the items is next to the tag bay (See 242 and 185 items shown in the display).

- o A second graphical preview indication that is a second visually distinct region, having a second starting width and a second ending width, the second visually distinct region being located in a proximity to a second icon representing a second filter, the second ending width having a width that is representative of an expected size of a second dataset, the second visually distinct region being adjacent to the first visually distinct region, the width of the second starting width being equal to the first ending width wherein the second graphical preview indication is separate from the second icon (Krehel figure 16a and b) Krehel shows a second tagging operation that is performed prior to a search query where the items shown in the display are a second data set after a tag operation is performed. The second data set is displayed next to the tag bay. The width of the region is set based on the data set size, notice in figure 16b the second data set width is smaller than the 427 items in the first bay and also the column with the 242 and the 185 items in it.

In regard to **Claims 25, 27**, claims 25, 27 reflect the computer readable storage medium comprising computer readable instructions for performing the steps of method claim 5 and 7, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to **Independent claim 14**, Krehel teaches a method comprising:

- o Displaying a user interface on a display, the user interface displaying graphical representations of a search query, wherein at least one or more portions of the search

Art Unit: 2179

query are divided into one or more query steps, each of the one or more query steps corresponding to a portion of the search query, each of the one or more query steps including one or more attributes; receiving user input that specifies a value for one attribute of the one or more attributes of one query step of the one or more query steps (See Figure 2 and 3 and column 10, lines 1-67) Krehel shows the individual filter and refine operations and tag operations in a container. Each step is distinct and defined in a separate bay along with attributes, shown in the lower portion. Krehel shows the user specifying the attribute for a tag operation (See undisputed and criterion edit panel 350).

- In response to the user input, performing an action on a portion of the search query corresponding to the one query step, the action being based on the value of the one attribute (See column 11, lines 40-57). Krehel teaches the user can input attributes from the criterion panel that are applied to the given filter or tag icons located within the container.
- Wherein the performing of the action includes independently disabling the one query step without removing the components of the one query step from the query representation, thereby disabling any portion of the search query corresponding to the one query step~ and wherein the one or more query steps are a plurality of query steps that are arranged in an order, and the order is alterable by dragging to a new location and dropping a query step selected from the plurality of query steps (See column 12, lines 30-40 and column 10, lines 5-10 and column 7, lines 10-25 and column 19, lines 5-10 and 50-67) Krehel teaches that a user can easily cancel a given tag operation to disable any tag operation and the data will revert to the pre-tag operation in the container. Krehel teaches the filter and tag operations can be arranged by the user drag and drop operations and dynamically in any manner they need to perform the query.

Art Unit: 2179

With respect to **dependent claim 16**, Krehel teaches the method wherein the one or more query steps are arranged in an order according to a query flow; and each query step is combined with other portions of the search query using Boolean logic (See column 10, lines 15-67 and column 11, lines 1-10).

With respect to **dependent claim 17**, Krehel teaches the method wherein the query steps are numbered according to an order in which the query steps are applied (See column 7, lines 1-30).

With respect to **dependent claim 19**, Krehel teaches the method further comprising creating within a query step a group icon representing a container for, and having contained within, a group of icons representing a group of filters associated with a portion of the search query (See column 7, lines 1-30 and column 19, lines 49-67 and column 20, lines 1-67).

With respect to **dependent claim 20**, Krehel teaches the method further comprising displaying a graphical representation of a search query for a multidimensional database (See column 6, lines 25-30).

In regard to **Claims 34, 36, 37, 39, and 40**, claims 34, 36, 37, 39, and 40 reflect the computer readable storage medium comprising computer readable instructions for performing the steps of method claim 14, 16, 17, 19 and 20, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. **The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:**

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. **Claims 10, 12, 30, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Szabo et al. (Patent No. 5,966,126) in view of Lanning et al. (Patent No. 6,366,299) and further in view of Hearst et al. (Patent No. 6,297,824).**

As to claim 10, Szabo et al. teaches displaying a user interface on a display (see e.g., Fig. 10 and col. 18, lines 43 – 46; i.e., the Boolean graphical user interface split screen is displayed on a computer display), the user interface displaying a graphical representation of a search query (see e.g., Fig. 10 and col. 20, lines 25 – 30; i.e., split screen 110 is a user interface displaying a graphical representation of a search query), including at least a first icon representing a first filter (see e.g., Fig. 10 and col. 20, lines 30 – 32; i.e., the first filter icon corresponds to the icon accepting input from "A" and "B"), a second icon representing a second filter (see e.g., Fig. 10 and col. 20, lines 30 – 32; i.e., the second filter icon corresponds to the icon accepting input from "C") associated with the search query (see e.g., Fig. 10; i.e., both icon filters are associated with an overall search query), but does not specifically mention prior to executing a search query to perform a search. Lanning et al. teaches prior to executing a search query to perform a search (see e.g., col. 2, lines 9 – 26; i.e., prior to executing a search query corresponds to anticipating search results before issuing a full query). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

Art Unit: 2179

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporate the user interface displayed on a display, wherein the user interface displayed a graphical representation of a search query, including at least a first icon representing a first filter, a second icon representing a second filter associated with the search query of Szabo et al. with prior to executing a search query to perform a search of Lanning et al. because anticipating search results before issuing a full query will speed up the query refinement and improve a query's probability of success (col. 2, lines 15 – 16).

Both Szabo et al. and Lanning et al. does not specifically mention including logical operator buttons, wherein each button is associated with a logical operator, and in response to a selection of the first icon and second icon and a selection of a button from the set of logical operator buttons, applying the logical operator associated with the selected button to the first and second icon. Hearst et al. teaches logical operator buttons (see e.g., Fig. 13, and col. 11, lines 49 – 54; i.e., the logical operator buttons corresponds to selection unit 222, wherein each selection unit 222 is a button used to activate an associated logic operator, such as "AND" and "NOT"), wherein each button is associated with a logical operator (see e.g., Fig. 13 and col. 11, lines 49 – 54; i.e., each selection unit 222 is associated with a corresponding logical operator, such as "AND" and "NOT"), and in response to a selection of the first icon and second icon (see e.g., Fig. 13, Fig. 15, and col. 11, lines 16 – 21; i.e., depicted in Fig. 15, the user selects 213b and 213c for inclusion of a logical operator) and a selection of a button from the set of logical operator buttons (see e.g., Fig. 13, Fig. 15, and col. 11, lines 16 – 21; i.e., depicted in Fig. 15, group object 222b is activated with a symbol "•", wherein 213b and 213c also incorporates the symbol "•"), applying the logical operator associated with the selected button to the first and second icon (see e.g., Fig. 13, Fig. 15, and col. 11, lines 16 – 21; i.e., i.e., the activation of 222b and further activating 213b and 213c while 222b is selected will produce a symbol "•" for 213b and 213c, wherein the logical operator "AND" that is associated with 222b will be applied to 213b and 213c). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate displaying a user interface on a display, displaying a graphical representation of a

Art Unit: 2179

search query, including at least a first icon representing a first filter, a second icon representing a second filter of Szabo et al. as modified by the prior to executing a search query to perform a search of Lanning et al. with the logical operator buttons, wherein each button is associated with a logical operator, and in response to a selection of the first icon and second icon and a selection of a button from the set of logical operator buttons, applying the logical operator associated with the selected button to the first and second icon of Hearst et al. because it allows a filter or a group of filters to be activated with a particular logical operator in a variety of ways (see e.g., col. 11, lines 11 – 25).

As to claim 12, this claim is analyzed with respect to claim 10 as previously discussed above. Both Szabo et al. and Lanning et al. does not specifically mention in response to the input, displaying a textual indication of a type of logical operator associated with the first icon and second icon. Hearst et al. teaches in response to the input, displaying a textual indication of a type of logical operator associated with the first icon and second icon (see e.g., Fig. 15 and col. 12, lines 33 – 36; i.e., the symbol “•” used to symbolize the activation of 213b, 213c, and 222b is also displayed with a textual indication “AND” of a type of logical operator associated with 213b and 213c). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate displaying a user interface on a display, displaying a graphical representation of a search query, including at least a first icon representing a first filter, a second icon representing a second filter of Szabo et al. as modified by the prior to executing a search query to perform a search of Lanning et al. with the displaying of a textual indication of a type of logical operator associated with the first icon and second icon of Hearst et al. because it allows a filter or a group of filters to be activated with a particular logical operator in a variety of ways (see e.g., col. 11, lines 11 – 25).

As to claim 30, claim 30 differs from claim 10 only in that claim 30 is an apparatus claim using a computer-readable storage medium (see e.g., col. 15, lines 13 – 17) containing executable instructions (see e.g., col. 17, lines 15 – 25; i.e., the executable instruction corresponds to “applets”) that when executed, causes a processor (see e.g., col. 16, line 6; i.e., processor) to

perform the steps of claim 10. Thus, claim 30 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 10 above.

As to claim 32, claim 32 differs from claim 12 only in that claim 32 is an apparatus claim using a computer-readable storage medium (see e.g., col. 15, lines 13 – 17) containing executable instructions (see e.g., col. 17, lines 15 – 25; i.e., the executable instruction corresponds to "applets") that when executed, causes a processor (see e.g., col. 16, line 6; i.e., processor) to perform the steps of claim 12. Thus, claim 32 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 12 above.

7. **Claims 11 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Szabo et al. (Patent No. 5,966,126) in view of Lanning et al. (Patent No. 6,366,299), in view of Hearst et al. (Patent No. 6,297,824), and further of Ono et al. (Patent No. 5,668,966).**

As to claim 11, this claim is analyzed with respect to claim 10 as previously discussed above. Szabo et al., Lanning et al., and Hearst et al. does not specifically mention a Boolean OR operator is applied when a first icon is substantially vertically aligned with the second icon, and a Boolean AND operator is applied when a first icon is substantially horizontally aligned with the second icon. Ono et al. teaches a Boolean OR operator is applied when a first icon is substantially vertically aligned with the second icon (see e.g., col. 9, lines 35 – 41; i.e., each object corresponding to an OR is placed immediately below is displayed), and a Boolean AND operator is applied when a first icon is substantially horizontally aligned with the second icon (see e.g., col. 9, lines 56 – 59; i.e., an AND is applied when the node has not next sibling on the same level). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate displaying a user interface on a display, displaying a graphical representation of a search query, including at least a first icon representing a first filter, a second icon representing a second filter of Szabo et al. as modified by the prior to executing a search query to perform a search of Lanning et al. as modified by the logical operator buttons, wherein each button is associated with a logical operator, and in response to a selection of the first icon

Art Unit: 2179

and second icon and a selection of a button from the set of logical operator buttons, applying the logical operator associated with the selected button to the first and second icon of Hearst et al. with a Boolean OR operator is applied when a first icon is substantially vertically aligned with the second icon, and a Boolean AND operator is applied when a first icon is substantially horizontally aligned with the second icon of Ono et al. because logical operators in a complex manner can be represented by a graphical data structure (see e.g., col. 10, lines 13 – 16).

As to claim 31, claim 31 differs from claim 11 only in that claim 31 is an apparatus claim using a computer-readable storage medium (see e.g., col. 15, lines 13 – 17) containing executable instructions (see e.g., col. 17, lines 15 – 25; i.e., the executable instruction corresponds to “applets”) that when executed, causes a processor (see e.g., col. 16, line 6; i.e., processor) to perform the steps of claim 11. Thus, claim 31 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 11 above.

8. **Claims 41 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Szabo et al. (Patent No. 5,966,126) in view of Lanning et al. (Patent No. 6,366,299), in view of Hearst et al. (Patent No. 6,297,824), and further in view of Neale et al. (Patent No. 6,925,608).**

As to claim 41, this claim is analyzed with respect to claim 10 as previously discussed above. Szabo et al., Lanning et al. and Hearst et al. does not specifically mention the logical operator buttons comprising a Boolean OR operator. Neale et al. teaches logical operator buttons comprising a Boolean OR operator (see e.g., Fig. 5; i.e., logical OR button 326). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate displaying a user interface on a display, displaying a graphical representation of a search query, including at least a first icon representing a first filter, a second icon representing a second filter of Szabo et al. as modified by the prior to executing a search query to perform a search of Lanning et al. as further modified by the logical operator buttons, wherein each button is associated with a logical operator, and in response to a selection of the first icon and second icon and a selection of a button from the set of logical operator buttons, applying the logical operator

Art Unit: 2179

associated with the selected button to the first and second icon of Hearst et al. with the logical operator buttons comprising a Boolean OR operator of Neale et al. because the logical operator button comprising an OR operator allows the user to combine selected search terms with a logical OR operator (see e.g., col. 8, lines 51 – 53).

As to claim 42, claim 42 differs from claim 41 only in that claim 42 is an apparatus claim using a computer-readable storage medium (see e.g., col. 15, lines 13 – 17) containing executable instructions (see e.g., col. 17, lines 15 – 25; i.e., the executable instruction corresponds to “applets”) that when executed, causes a processor (see e.g., col. 16, line 6; i.e., processor) to perform the steps of claim 41. Thus, claim 42 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 41 above.

It is noted that any citation to specific pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re Lemelson, 397 F.2d 1006, 1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 5, 7, 14, 16 – 17, 19-20, 25, 27, 34, 36-37, 39-40 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's argument that the prior art of Hearst does not teach graphically representing a query

Applicant argues that the prior art of Hearst does not teach graphically representing a search query because the applicant interprets the prior art of Hearst as teaching entering a hierarchical structure that is applied to a database (See arguments, page 14).

The Examiner disagrees.

Hearst teaches a query construction object 216 that allows a user to graphically construct a search query by selecting the Boolean operations and entering the values for which will be run

Art Unit: 2179

against a database via a query (See column 11, lines 10-60). The Examiner interprets the phrases "*constructing a Boolean query*" and "*query construction object visually indicates that the query constructed with it will be a conjunction of disjuncts via display of the word "AND" in between objects 220*" and "*the present interactive interface also includes search button 218. Search button 218 responds to activation or a "click on it" by taking the text terms and categories associated with each group object 220, constructing a query that is a conjoining of disjuncts, and submitting that query to the associated search engine. Search button 218 may be displayed on query construction object 216 or near it*" as teaching a process of visually constructing and displaying a query that is executed against a database.

Applicant's argument the Hearst does not perform the action of applying the logical operator
Applicant argues that the process of applying the selection of the first and second icon and a selection button from a set of logical operators in Hearst does not yield a result because nothing occurs because the user has to hit the search button for the operation to occur (See arguments page 14).

The Examiner disagrees.

Giving a broad reasonable interpretation of claim 10, the Examiner interprets the argued limitation in claim 10 as applying the logical operator to the first and second icon but **not** actually running the search process or performing any other operation other than applying the operator to the first and second icon. Given the interpretation, Hearst teaches a process of allowing the user via the query construction object to apply the "AND" operator to two categories. The process of applying the logical operator is supported in column 11, lines 30-43 and 49-51 and column 12, lines 20-40, where a given group object can have a unique symbol located in 220 and the "NOT" operator is shown with an "X" in 220 and the inclusion operation can be shown with a symbol. Therefore, the Examiner interprets the process of the user selecting the logical operation and then entering the category value in the field as a process of applying the logical operator to icons within the query.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven B. Theriault whose telephone number is (571) 272-5867. The examiner can normally be reached on M, W, F 10:00AM - 8:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on (571) 272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit: 2179

SBT

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Weilun Lo', with a stylized, cursive script.

WEILUN LO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER